

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:18-cr-20788

v.

Honorable Thomas L. Ludington

ANTHONY DARNELL WILSON,

Defendant.

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR COMPASSIONATE RELEASE
WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

On November 28, 2018, Defendant was indicted by a grand jury on one count of distribution of fentanyl. ECF No. 1. He pled guilty and was sentenced to 170 months incarceration followed by three years of supervised release. ECF No. 25. On April 26, 2021, Defendant filed a motion for compassionate release. ECF No. 27.

I.

The United States is facing an unprecedented challenge with the novel coronavirus (“COVID-19”) pandemic.

The COVID-19 virus is highly infectious and can be transmitted easily from person to person. COVID-19 fatality rates increase with age and underlying health conditions such as cardiovascular disease, respiratory disease, diabetes, and immune compromise. If contracted, COVID-19 can cause severe complications or death.

Wilson v. Williams, 961 F.3d 829, 833 (6th Cir. 2020). In light of the threat posed by COVID-19, Defendant seeks a reduction of his sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)—a form of relief often referred to as “compassionate release.” Section 3582(c)(1)(A) provides,

The court may not modify a term of imprisonment once it has been imposed except . . . upon motion of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, or upon motion of the

defendant after the defendant has fully exhausted all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the Bureau of Prisons to bring a motion on the defendant's behalf or the lapse of 30 days from the receipt of such a request by the warden of the defendant's facility, whichever is earlier, may reduce the term of imprisonment . . . after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a) to the extent that they are applicable, if it finds that . . . extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant such a reduction . . . and that such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission

18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). Accordingly, the threshold question is exhaustion. If exhaustion is found, courts must then follow the statute's three-step test:

At step one, a court must “find[]” whether “extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant” a sentence reduction. At step two, a court must “find[]” whether “such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission.” The Commission's policy statement on compassionate release resides in U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13. Thus, if § 1B1.13 is still “applicable,” courts must “follow the Commission's instructions in [§ 1B1.13] to determine the prisoner's eligibility for a sentence modification and the extent of the reduction authorized.” At step three, “§ 3582(c)[(1)(A)] instructs a court to consider any applicable § 3553(a) factors and determine whether, in its discretion, the reduction authorized by [steps one and two] is warranted in whole or in part under the particular circumstances of the case.”

United States v. Jones, 980 F.3d 1098, 1107–08 (6th Cir. 2020) (6th Cir. Nov. 20, 2020) (internal citations omitted). “In cases where incarcerated persons [as opposed to the Bureau of Prisons] file motions for compassionate release, federal judges may skip step two of the § 3582(c)(1)(A) inquiry and have full discretion to define ‘extraordinary and compelling’ without consulting the policy statement § 1B1.13.” *Id.* at 1111. “[D]istrict courts may deny compassionate-release motions when any of the three prerequisites listed in § 3582(c)(1)(A) is lacking and do not need to address the others.” *United States v. Elias*, 984 F.3d 516, 519 (6th Cir. 2021).

As explained in the statute, before a court may consider an inmate's request for a reduced sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582, the inmate must first exhaust his administrative remedies with the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”) or wait 30 days after making such a request. The Sixth Circuit has explained that:

By creating a compassionate-release option in the First Step Act, Congress gave inmates an option to seek early release on health grounds. The seriousness of COVID-19 and its spread in many prisons make it all the more imperative that the prisons have authority to process these applications fairly and with due regard for the seriousness of each inmate's risk. Free-floating exceptions to the rule, available to anyone willing to go to federal court first, will not help that cause.

United States v. Alam, 960 F.3d 831, 835–36 (6th Cir. 2020).

Defendant did not indicate in his Motion whether he sought compassionate release from the BOP. While the Court is aware of the time sensitive nature of Defendant's request, the Sixth Circuit has clearly stated that Defendants must first seek release from the BOP rather than come directly to the courts. Defendant may re-file his Motion for Compassionate Release, if he includes evidence of exhaustion.

Defendant further seeks the appointment of counsel. He explains that he suffers from a learning disability and there are "severe restrictions" to the law library due to COVID-19 quarantines. ECF No. 27 at PageID.133. The Sixth Amendment secures to a defendant who faces incarceration the right to counsel at all "critical stages" of the criminal process. *United States v. Wade*, 388 U.S. 218, 224 (1967). The Supreme Court has held that prisoners' post-conviction right to counsel extends only to the first appeal of right and no further. *Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987). The decision to appoint counsel is within the discretion of the court, and the appointment of counsel is only required where the interests of justice or due process so require. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 638 (6th Cir. 1986). Appointment of counsel is therefore required only if, given the difficulty of the case and defendant's ability, the defendant could not obtain justice without an attorney, he could not obtain a lawyer on his own, and he would have a reasonable chance of winning with the assistance of counsel. *See Thirkield v. Pitcher*, 199 F. Supp. 2d 637, 653 (E.D. Mich. 2002). Defendant has not satisfied the high burden of demonstrating that appointment of counsel is warranted. Seeking compassionate relief does not involve complex facts

or legal doctrines that would prevent Defendant from effectively bringing his claim on his own behalf. Defendant's Motion for Appointment of Counsel will be denied.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Compassionate Release, ECF No. 27, is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

It is further **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Request for Appointment of Counsel is **DENIED**.

Dated: May 5, 2021

s/Thomas L. Ludington
THOMAS L. LUDINGTON
United States District Judge